

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Advisory Action mailed June 5, 2009 and the Final Office Action mailed April 13, 2009. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-17, 26 and 27 were pending in the Application and stand rejected. Applicant has amended several Independent Claims in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the instant case. The amendments are not the result of any Prior Art reference and, thus, do not narrow the scope of any of the claims. Furthermore, the amendments are not related to patentability issues and only further clarify subject matter already present. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejection

Claims 1-9 and 26 are rejected as being anticipated by Gai, et al. (hereinafter "*Gai*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A computer readable medium having stored thereon data representing instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising:
 - generating a tag describing an object captured during transmission from an origination address to a destination address, wherein the tag includes,
 - a source address field to indicate an origination address of the object,
 - a destination address field to indicate a destination address of the object,
 - a source port field to indicate an origination port of the object,
 - a destination port field to indicate a destination port of the object,
 - a content field to indicate a content type from a plurality of content types identifying a type of content contained in the object, and
 - a time field to indicate when the object was captured; and
 - storing the tag in a database, wherein the tag indexes a captured object in storage, **the tag being stored to allow subsequent searching for the tag based on one or more of the fields, wherein a tag signature is generated based on the tag, and wherein the object and the tag signature are evaluated to verify if they have been modified since original storage.**

In regards to this last limitation, there is simply nothing in any of the cited references for this subsequent searching activity for the tag. This same tag indexes a captured object in storage. As a separate matter, there is no disclosure that accounts for the verification operations outlined in Independent Claim 1. *Gai* fails to offer a verification process: much less a verification process evaluating whether the object and the tag signature have been modified since originally stored. Additionally, nothing in *Gai* discloses items being captured, as opposed to merely receiving a packet. For this limitation, the Examiner cites various passages in *Gai* that only discuss a simple ‘reception’ of packets. This limitation, standing alone, should confer patentability to the instant claim set.

All of the limitations discussed *supra* are provided for in Independent Claim 1, but no reference of record includes such elements. Applicant has reviewed *Gai* in its entirety and finds nothing that would be relevant to such operations. The other Independent Claims recite limitations that are similar, but not identical, and therefore are also allowable using a similar rationale. For at least these reasons, Independent Claims 1, 14, 26, and 27 are allowable over the cited references. Additionally, the corresponding dependent claims from these Independent Claims are also patentably distinct for analogous reasons.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 10-17 and 27 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Gai* in view of “Cryptographic Hash Functions” issued to Bart Preneel (hereinafter “*Preneel*”). This rejection is now moot in light of the §102 analysis provided above. More specifically, the rejection is moot because none of the cited references include any of the limitations outlined *supra*.

For at least these reasons, all of the pending claims have been shown to be allowable as they are patentable over the references of record. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested in the form of a full allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

The Request for Continued Examination fee for \$810 is being paid concurrently herewith via the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account No. 50-4889 authorization. No additional fees are believed due. However, please apply any other charges or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4889 of PATENT CAPITAL GROUP, referencing the attorney docket number referenced above.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214-823-1241.

Respectfully submitted,

Patent Capital Group
Attorneys for Applicant

/Thomas J. Frame/

Thomas J. Frame
Reg. No. 47,232

Date: July 6, 2009

Customer No. 78855